

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed July 6, 2010. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 11-13 and 15-20 remain pending as amended above. Claims 19-20 are new.

Initially, the undersigned would like to thank Examiner Partridge for most recently discussing the present application on December 1, 2010. In accordance with that discussion, Applicant has amended the independent claims which should be in condition for allowance. However, if any further issues remain, Examiner Partridge is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at 303-800-6678 to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Also, the rejection of claims 11-13 and 15-18 under 35 USC § 112, first and second paragraphs, is believed to be fully addressed via the above-detailed amendments to the independent claims in accordance with Examiner's suggestion.

### 35 USC § 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 11-13 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rotenberg (NPL "A Microarchitectural Approach to Fault Tolerance in Microprocessors").

Claims 11-13 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reinhardt et al. (NPL "Transient Fault Detection via Simultaneous Multithreading").

Initially, each of these rejections is respectfully traversed as the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or even suggest the claimed combination of features such as set forth in any of the pending claims.

More particularly, as previously indicated by the Office:

the prior art is on an instruction by instruction basis. The problem is that  
the claims make not specific requirement of how the committing process  
occurs as at best it says "a single set of the exposed stores" but fails to  
define what a set is or any other aspect of the process. For that matter,

In response, in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention), and to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claim 11 to in part recite that “a single set of the exposed stores” are to be committed to an “architectural memory state corresponding to the dynamic sequential program”. Support for this amendment may be readily found in the present specification, see, e.g., paragraph 39.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach (or even suggest) the claimed combination of features such as set forth in claim 11, including for example, committing a single set of the exposed stores (which are claimed to be compared) to an architectural memory state. Accordingly, claim 11 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The remaining independent claim recites similar (though not identical) language as claim 11 and has been rejected for similar reasons as claim 11. Hence, these remaining independent claim should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 11, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

For example, new claims 19-20 are believed to further distinguish the cited art. See, e.g., paragraph 33 of the specification.

Filing Date: December 30, 2003

Title: BUFFERING UNCHECKED STORES FOR FAULT DETECTION IN REDUNDANT MULTITHREADING SYSTEMS USING  
SPECULATIVE MEMORY SUPPORT

---

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (303-800-6678) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Applicant hereby petitions, as well as includes the appropriate fee herewith (in the form of credit card authorization), to obtain an extension of the period for responding to the Office action, thereby moving the deadline for response from October 6, 2010 to December 6, 2010 (and further to December 7, 2010 due to USPTO closure).

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890**

Telephone Number: 303-800-6678

Date 12/6/10

By /Ramin Aghevli – Reg. No. 43,462/

Ramin Aghevli

Reg. No. 43,462